

### REMARKS

This application, as amended herein, contains claims 9, 11, 12, 20 and 21 and newly added claim 22. Claims 1 - 6, 8, 10 and 13 - 18 were previously canceled. Claims 7 and 19 have been canceled herein.

Claims 7, 9 - 12, and 19 - 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vorobiev. Claim 19 was rejected as obvious over Vorobiev in view of the holding of In re Venner.

As previously noted, Applicants' invention, as set forth in new independent claim 20, is directed to the structure of Fig. 2, including several of the components thereof. However, claim 20 has been amended herein to recite that the means for comparing includes an intelligent program with a rule database, which automatically checks credentials of a new content provider and establishes a decision whether to accept or reject the new content provider. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at page 4, line 21 to page 5, line 1. As further noted in the amendment to claim 20, this automatically registers new providers. Claim 20 has also been amended to state that the checking means for the portal checks the new content semi-automatically or fully automatically.

Applicant's invention, as set forth in claim 20, provides a complete and automatic content publishing system. New content providers are automatically accepted

or rejected. New content is checked semi-automatically or fully automatically. There is no teaching or suggestion in Vorobiev of such a complete, end-to-end automatic content publishing system.

While the Examiner has found portions of Vorobiev that may function in somewhat similar ways to the structures of claim 20, there is no teaching or suggestion of the particular organization of functional blocks of claim 20. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner, in the Examiner's assertion that Vorobiev teaches or suggests the specific combination of blocks set forth in claim 20. In fact the portals described in Vorobiev have a much simpler structure and do not perform the functions set forth for the various elements of claim 20. Specifically, Vorobiev does not teach or suggest the combination of blocks including a publish service for receiving information from the content provider concerning the new content which the content provider can provide for publication by the portal; a portal content queue for storing the information; a portal content catalogue for storing accepted new content; a portal configuration in which entire available content of the portal is assembled; a portal user configuration storage for storing preferences of a user and for providing a notification to a user if new content matches preferences of the user; and a portal aggregation for assembling content to be sent to the user in response to a user request to the portal for information from a content provider. In view of the above, and in view of the amendments made to claim 20, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is directed to patentable subject matter.

Newly added claim 22 recites means for sending a message of the decision of the administrator means to a content provider that provided content. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification, at page 5, lines 17-18. Thus, the content provider is notified of the nature of the semi-automatically or fully automatically made decision, and may be in a position to seek to have it changed if it is not favorable. The prior art does not teach or suggest this approach. It is thus submitted that claim 22 is also directed to patentable subject matter.

The remaining original claims depend from independent claim 20. These claims recite further elements, which in combination with the elements of claim 20, are not shown or suggested in the art of record. For the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 20 it is submitted that the remaining claims are also patentable.

In view of the allowable nature of the subject matter of all of the claims, if the Examiner cannot issue an immediate allowance, it is respectfully requested that he contact the undersigned to resolve any remaining issues.

Applicants respectfully request an extension of time of one month for the filing of this paper. A check in the amount of \$120 is enclosed to cover the required fee.

Respectfully submitted,

David Aker  
David Aker, Reg. No. 29,277  
23 Southern Road  
Hartsdale, NY 10530  
Tel. & Fax 914 674-1094

6/8/2007  
Date